

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-33 have been examined and are rejected. In the above amendments, claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 17, 20-23, 25-27 and 30-32 have been amended. Therefore, after entry of the above amendments, claims 1-33 will be pending in this application. Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 23, 25 and 26 are objected to because of various noted informalities. Claims 23, 25 and 26 have been amended to correct the noted informalities. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful reading of the claims.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7-13, 17-25 and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3, 7-13, 17-25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Frid *et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,239).

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites:

“A method of wireless communications, comprising:
monitoring a first network in accordance with a first air interface on a first carrier frequency; and
receiving a message from a second network through the first air interface, the second network being associated with a second air interface different from the first air interface and operating on a second carrier frequency different from the first carrier frequency.”

Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Frid for at least the following reasons.

First, Frid does not describe “receiving a message from a second network through the first air interface, the second network being associated with a second air interface different from the first air interface,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, Frid describes mobile station/data terminal equipment (MS/DTE) **130** having a packet-switched data connection **150** and a circuit-switched connection **160** via a single air interface for Personal Digital Cellular System (PDC). (See column 3, lines 58-59, and column 4, lines 53-54.) Frid states “in the PDC, ... the uplink UPCH is a random access type and is exemplary of a packet-switched data

connection **150**. The circuit-switched connection **160**, on the other hand, is exemplified by at least the Traffic Channel (TCH).” (See column 5, lines 12-18.) For FIG. 3, Frid states “the packet-switched PDC network portion **350** corresponds to the packet-switched data connection **150** (e.g., a communication via the UPCH of the PDC). The circuit-switched PDC network portion **360** corresponds to the circuit-switched connection **160** (e.g., a communication via the TCH of the PDC).” (See column 6, lines 7-13.) Thus, MS/DTE **130** communicates through a single air interface (PDC) for both packet-switched data connection **150** and circuit-switched connection **160**, which correspond to different channels of the same air interface. Frid does not disclose receiving a message from a second network through a first air interface, with the second network being associated with a second air interface different from the first air interface, as recited in claim 1.

Second, Frid does not describe “monitoring a first network ... on a first carrier frequency, and receiving a message from a second network through the first air interface, the second network ... operating on a second carrier frequency different from the first carrier frequency,” as recited in claim 1. Rather, in Frid, packet-switched data connection **150** and circuit-switched connection **160** are presumably on the same carrier frequency since they are for the same air interface. The rejection suggests that this feature of claim 1 is disclosed by Frid in columns 1-2, lines 67-5. This section states “maintaining both the packet-switched data connection and the circuit-switched voice call at the same time requires a complicated and costly cellular phone that can operate on two channels (and probably two separate frequencies) simultaneously.” (See columns 1-2, lines 67-5.) This section does not describe receiving a message from a second network operating on a second carrier frequency through a first network operating on a first carrier frequency, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Frid. Claims 2, 3 and 7-9 are dependent on claim 1 and are not anticipated by Frid for at least the reasons noted for base claim 1.

Independent claims 11, 21 and 27 have been amended to recite the features noted above for claim 1. Claims 13 and 17-20 are dependent on claim 12, and claims 21-26 are dependent on claim 21. Claims 11-13, 17-25 and 27 are not anticipated by Frid for at least the reasons noted for claim 1.

Accordingly, the §102(c) rejection of claims 1-3, 7-13, 17-25 and 27 should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 30-33 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Carlsson *et al* (U.S. Serial No. 2002/0145987).

Claim 30 of the present application, as amended, recites:

“A method of communications, comprising:
receiving from a subscriber station a request for an identifier to support communications with a packet-switched network after the subscriber station moves from a first geographic region into a second geographic region, the subscriber station initially communicating with a first base station controller in a circuit-switched network associated with a first air interface, the request being received by a second base station controller in the circuit-switched network, the packet-switched network being associated with a second air interface different from the first air interface, and the request being transmitted by the subscriber station through the first air interface;
retrieving by the second base station controller from the first base station controller information to support the communications between the subscriber station and the packet-switched network; and
sending the identifier from the second base station controller to the subscriber station through the first air interface.”

Applicant submits that claim 30 is not anticipated by Carlsson for at least the following reasons.

First, Carlsson does not describe “receiving from a subscriber station a request for an identifier to support communications with a packet-switched network ..., the packet-switched network being associated with a second air interface different from the first air interface, and the request being transmitted by the subscriber station through the first air interface,” as recited in claim 30. The rejection suggests that this feature is disclosed by Carlsson in paragraphs 26 and 27. Paragraph 26 states “Gateway MSC/VLR 210 may control circuit-related signaling to/from the mobile terminal 110 during those periods when mobile station is camped on a packet channel. Gateway MSC/VLR 205 tunnels this signaling to the mobile terminal 110.” This entire description is for circuit-switched network 150 in FIG. 2, which presumably uses a single air interface. This section of Carlsson does not describe transmitting a request through a first air interface for an identifier to support communications with a packet-switched network using a second air interface, as recited in claim 1.

Second, Carlsson does not describe “retrieving by the second base station controller from the first base station controller [both being in the circuit-switched network] information to support the communications between the subscriber station and the packet-switched network,” as recited in claim 30. Carlsson states “each base station controller may interconnect a number of base transceiver stations to the circuit-switched network **150** or packet-switched network **155**.” (See paragraph 23.) Carlsson does not describe retrieving information to support the communications between the subscriber station and the packet-switched network from the first base station controller in the circuit-switched network, as recited in claim 30.

Third, Carlsson does not describe “sending the identifier from the second base station controller to the subscriber station through the first air interface,” as recited in claim 30. The cited paragraphs of Carlsson do not describe requesting or sending an identifier and further does not describe sending this identifier through the first air interface to support communications with a packet-switched network using a second air interface.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 30 is not anticipated by Carlsson. Claim 31 is dependent on claim 30 and is not anticipated by Carlsson for at least the reasons noted for base claim 30.

Claim 32 of the present application, as amended, recites:

“A method of communications, comprising:

transmitting a signal from a packet-switched network through a base station controller to a subscriber station in accordance with a first air interface while the subscriber station moves from a first geographic region to a second geographic region, the base station controller being located in the first geographic region;

receiving from the subscriber station a registration request to support communications with a circuit-switched network after the subscriber station moves into the second geographic region, the registration request being received by the base station controller, the circuit-switched network being associated with a second air interface different from the first air interface, and the request being transmitted by the subscriber station through the first air interface; and

registering the subscriber station with a mobile switching center for the second geographic region, the registration being performed by the base station controller.”

Applicant submits that claim 32 is not anticipated by Carlsson for at least the following reasons.

First, Carlsson does not describe “receiving from the subscriber station a registration request to support communications with a circuit-switched network ..., the circuit-switched network being associated with a second air interface different from the first air interface, and the request being transmitted by the subscriber station through the first air interface,” as recited in claim 32. Carlsson does not describe transmitting a request through the first air interface to support communications with another network using the second air interface, as discussed above for claim 30.

Second, Carlsson does not describe “registering the subscriber station with a mobile switching center for the second geographic region, the registration being performed by the base station controller,” as recited in claim 32.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 32 is not anticipated by Carlsson. Claim 33 is dependent on claim 32 and is not anticipated by Carlsson for at least the reasons noted for base claim 32.

Accordingly, the §102(c) rejection of claims 30-33 should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 4-6, 14-16, 26, 28 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4-6, 14-16, 26, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frid *et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,239) in view of Carlsson *et al* (U.S. Serial No. 2002/0145987).

Claims 4-6 are dependent on claim 1, claims 14-16 are dependent on claim 11, claim 26 is dependent on claim 21, and claims 28 and 29 are dependent on claim 27. Frid does not disclose all of the elements of base claims 1, 11, 21 and 27, as discussed above. Hence, Frid is an insufficient basis for the §103(a) rejection of dependent claims 4-6, 14-16, 26, 28 and 29. Carlsson does not address the deficiencies of Frid.

Accordingly, the §103(a) rejection of claims 4-6, 14-16, 26, 28 and 29 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit
Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 17, 2007

By: /Kristine U. Ekwueme/
Kristine U. Ekwueme, Reg. No. 56, 344
(858) 658-1901

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502